

Objectives Analysis Process

On July 26, the *Roadmap* Agency Advisory Group prioritized the business objectives for the core financials feasibility study using a process that was designed to record feedback from each agency represented in the Agency Advisory Group.

Each agency rated the business objectives in three categories and a value was assigned to the ratings as follows:

Categories	Rating/Value		
Logical Sequence	Foundational (5)	Functional (3)	Nice to Have (1)
Measurable Value	High (5)	Medium (3)	Low (1)
Accountability	High (5)	Medium (3)	Low (1)

We analyzed the category prioritization ratings by total score and by weighted average score.

1. Total Score – The sum of all categories using the values above.
2. Weighted Average – The average of the sum of all categories divided by the number of total votes received in that category for that objective.

Both analyses led to similar conclusions.

Each objective was then given a value of high (H), medium (M) or low (L) based on its overall weighted average and its logical sequence rating using the ratings in the table below. The intent was to elevate items that might be slightly lower in measurable value or accountability but were considered foundational.

Score	Weighted Average	Or Logical Sequence Rating
High	4.00 – 5.00	Over 4.00
Medium	3.00 – 3.99	Between 3.00 and 4.00
Low	2.39 – 2.99	

Overall, the group gave the highest ratings to objectives that create the foundation for an enterprise solution. Examples are: core financial management and accountability, standardized chart of accounts, and enterprise customer and vendor identification.

Medium priority ratings were given to objectives that were characterized as functional business processes such as financial reporting or enhanced customer service largely because measurable value ratings in these areas tended to be lower.

Lower priority ratings were given to objectives related to cost accounting.